

A NOTE ON THE TERM YOGA IN NYĀYABHĀṢYA  
AND NYĀYAVĀRTTIKA ON I, 1, 29

Commenting on *Nyāyasūtra* I, 1, 29 (*samānatantrasiddhaḥ paratantrasiddhaḥ pratitantrasiddhānataḥ* 'A tenet peculiar to each system is that which is established in similar<sup>1</sup> systems and not established in other systems'), Vātsyāyana writes: *yathā nāsata ātmalābhah, na sata ātmahānam; niratiśayāś cetanāḥ, dehendriyamanahsu viśayeṣu tattatkāraṇeṣu ca viśeṣa iti Sāṃkhyānām; — puruṣakarmādinimitto bhūtasargaḥ, karmahetavo doṣāḥ pravṛttiś ca; svaguṇaviśiṣṭās cetanāḥ; asad utpadyate, utpannam nirudhyata iti Yogānām*<sup>2</sup> 'For instance, of the Sāṃkhya-s: the non-existent does not come into being, the existent cannot be destroyed; the souls are not distinct<sup>3</sup>, distinction lies in the body, the

1. *Samāna* is interpreted by Vācaspatimiśra in the sense of 'one' (*eka*). This is also the interpretation given by Viśvanātha. (Vācaspatimiśra's *Nyāyavārttikatātparyāṭikā*, and Viśvanātha's *Nyāyasūtravṛtti*, p. 264, in the edition cited below, n. 2). Jayantabhaṭṭa, however, understands the word in the sense of 'similar': *yathāsmākam īśvarecchāpreritaparamāṇumirmītāni prthivyādini samānatantre Kaṇavratamate tathāiva siddhāni, paratantrē ca Sāṃkhyādiśāstre tathā nābhyupagamyanta iti; yathā vā guṇatrayātmikāyāḥ prakṛter mahadaḥaṃkāradikrameṇa bhūtasarga iti Sāṃkhyānāṃ svatantrasiddho 'rthaḥ samānatantre 'pi Pātāñjale Yogaśāstre siddha eva, paratantrē tu Vaiśeṣikādimate na siddha iti. (Nyāyamañjarī II, p. 128: ed. by Sūrya Nārāyaṇa Śukla, Benares, 1934 [Kāśī Sanskrit Series No. 106]). So also does Raghūttama (see p. 42 below). See also on this point *Nyāyakośa* of Jhalakīkar (3rd edition, Poona, Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, 1928), s.v. *pratitantrasiddhānta*; W. Ruben, *Die Nyāyasūtra's: Text, Übersetzung, Erläuterung und Glossar* (= *Abhandlungen für die Kunde des Morgenlandes XVIII*, 2, Leipzig, Deutsche Morgenländische Gesellschaft, 1928), Anm. 74 (p. 177).*

2. *Nyāyadarśanam with Vātsyāyana's Bhāṣya, Uddyotakara's Vārttika, Vācaspati Miśra's Tātparyāṭikā & Viśvanātha's Vṛtti*, ed. by Tārānātha Nyāya-Tarkatīrtha and Amarendramohan Tarkatīrtha, Calcutta, 1936 (Calcutta Sanskrit Series No. XVIII), p. 264.

3. Vācaspatimiśra interprets *atiśaya* and *viśeṣa* in the sense of 'change' (*pariṇāma*): *cetanā ātmānaḥ, niratiśayā aparīṇāmīno na kenacid dharmenopajānāpāyadharmeṇa yujyante, prakṛteṣu ca tatkāraṇeṣu mahadaḥaṃkārapañcātannmātrabhūta-*

sense-organs, the organ of thought, the objects, and their respective causes<sup>4</sup>; — of the Yoga-s: the material creation is due to *karman* of the souls, etc., defects and activity are the causes of *karman*; the souls are characterized by their own qualities; the non-existent comes into being and what is produced ceases to exist'. Uddyotakara in his *Vārttika* does not explain the *Bhāṣya*, but gives another set of illustrations, using the same nomenclature: *yathā bhautikānīndriyāṇīti Yogānām, abhautikānīti Sāṃkhyaṇām*<sup>5</sup> 'For instance, of the Yoga-s: the sense-organs are elemental; — of the Sāṃkhya-s: the sense-organs are non-elemental'.

The juxtaposition of *Sāṃkhya* and *Yoga* in these passages has led some scholars to think that Vātsyāyana and Uddyotakara have in mind the systems known under these names. Thus S.N. Dasgupta in his *History of Indian Philosophy* writes:

'Vātsyāyana, however, in his *bhāṣya* on *Nyāyasūtra*, I. 1. 29, distinguishes Sāṃkhya and Yoga in the following way: The Sāṃkhya holds that nothing can come into being nor be destroyed, there cannot be any change<sup>6</sup> in the pure intelligence (*nīratīśayāḥ cetanāḥ*). All changes are due to changes in the body, the senses, the manas and the objects. Yoga holds that all creation is due to the karma of the puruṣa. Doṣas (passions) and pravṛtti (action) are the cause of karma. The intelligences or souls (*cetana*) are associated with qualities. Non-being can come into being and what is produced may be destroyed. The last view is indeed quite different from the Yoga of *Vyāsabhāṣya*. It is closer to Nyāya in its doctrines. If Vātsyāyana's statement is correct, it would appear that the doctrine of there being a moral purpose in creation was borrowed by Sāṃkhya from Yoga... Curiously enough Vātsyāyana quotes a passage from

*sūkṣmeṣu viśeṣo 'tīśaya ity arthaḥ*. (*Nyāyavārttikatātparyāṭikā*, p. 264, edition cited in the preceding note). But cf. H. Jacobi, 'Über das ursprüngliche Yogasystem', *Sitzungsberichte der Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften*, Berlin, 1929, p. 609, and E. Frauwallner, *Geschichte der indischen Philosophie* II (Salzburg, 1956), p. 103: 'Die Seelen sind nicht verschieden; der Unterschied liegt vielmehr in den Objekten, dem Körper, den Sinnesorganen und dem Denkkorgan und ihren jeweiligen Ursachen'. This interpretation is supported by Raghūttama, author of the commentary on the *Nyāyabhāṣya*, called *Bhāṣyacandra: nīratīśayāḥ nirviśeṣāḥ... saguṇaviśeṣā* (Raghūttama thus reads this portion of the *Bhāṣya*, instead of *svaguṇaviśiṣṭāḥ* as in the text reproduced here) *ity anena nīratīśayatve vipratipattiḥ*. (*The Nyāya-Darśana: The Sūtras of Gautama and Bhāṣya of Vātsyāyana with two Commentaries (1) The Khadyota by Mahāmahopādhyāya Gangānātha Jha, and (2) The Bhāṣyachandra by Raghūttama - up to Adhyāya iii, Āhnika ii, Sūtra 17 only, with Notes by Pandit Ambadās Shastri, edited by Mahāmahopādhyāya Gangānātha Jha and Pandit Dhundhirāja Shastri Nyāyopādhyāya, Benares, 1925 [Chowkhambā Sanskrit Series], p. 132*).

4. That is, according to Vācaspati (see n. 3 above), the *mahānt*, the *ahamkāra*, the five *tanmātra*-s, and the *bhūtasūkṣma*-s.

5. *Nyāyavārttika*, p. 264 (edition cited n. 2 above).

6. Cf. n. 3 above.

Vyāsabhāṣya, III. 13, in his bhāṣya, I, ii. 6, and criticizes it as self-contradictory (*viruddha*)<sup>7</sup>.

As far as Sāṃkhya is concerned, there is no problem here: Vātsyāyana and Uddyotakara mean the Sāṃkhya system. But it seems difficult to interpret Yoga, mentioned by them, in the sense of the Yoga system. The Pandits interpret the word *yoga* in the *Nyāyabhāṣya* in the sense of Vaiśeṣika, for the *asatkāryavāda*, which Vātsyāyana attributes to the Yoga-s (*asad utpadyate, utpannam nirudhyate*)<sup>8</sup>, is foreign to the Yoga system. Gaṅgānātha Jhā, however, pointed out that the Naiyāyika-s are meant: *prasiddhayogaśāstre 'sadutpatter anabhyupagamād yogaśabdenātra Vaiśeṣikā evābhipretā iti kecit. tattvatas tu yogaśabdenātra Naiyāyikā evābhipretāḥ. etasminn arthe 'sya prayogo bahuśo labhyate prācīnagrantheṣu*<sup>9</sup>. In a valuable note entitled 'A Peculiar Meaning of «Yoga»', published in the *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain and Ireland*, 1927, pp. 854-8<sup>10</sup>, K. Chaṭṭopādhyāya collected all the passages from the Jaina texts (already known to Pandit Phaṇibhūṣaṇa Tarkavāgīśa and to Pandit Gopīnātha Kavirāj), illustrating the peculiar use of the term *yoga* or *yauga* for designating the followers of Nyāya and Vaiśeṣika. He also quoted a passage from the *Nyāyasiddhāntamālā* of Jayarāma, which clearly identifies the Yoga-s (read here Yauga) of the *Nyāyavārttika* passage with the Naiyāyika-s: *Naiyāyika-Sāṃkhyayoḥ kathāyām bhautikānāndriyānīti Yaugānām abhautikānīti Sāṃkhyānām iti Vārttike Yaugānām = Naiyāyikānām*. Of course, Chaṭṭopādhyāya recalled the well-known difference on this point between Sāṃkhya and Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika: while according to Sāṃkhya the sense-organs originate from *ahamkāra* and not from the 'elements'<sup>11</sup>, Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika considers them to be

7. S.N. Dasgupta, *History of Indian Philosophy I* (Cambridge, 1922; reprinted 1932), p. 228, note. Dasgupta clearly misreads the *Nyāyavārttika* passage quoted above, when he writes (*loc. cit.*): 'Udyotakara's (sic) remarks on the same sūtra do not indicate a difference but an agreement between Sāṃkhya and Yoga on the doctrine of the *indriyas* being «*abhautika*»'. On *Nyāyabhāṣya* I, 2, 6, referred to by Dasgupta, cf. Otto Strauss, 'Eine alte Formel der Sāṃkhya-Yoga-Philosophie bei Vātsyāyana', *Beiträge zur Literaturwissenschaft und Geistesgeschichte Indiens* (= *Festgabe Hermann Jacobi*), herausgegeben von Willibald Kirfel, Bonn, 1926, pp. 358-68. See also Ruben, *op. cit.*, Anm. 216 (p. 206).

8. Cf. M. Hiriyanna, *Outlines of Indian Philosophy* (London, 1932; fifth impression 1964), p. 239.

9. *Khadyota*, p. 133 (edition cited p. 40, n. 3 above). See also his edition and translation of the *Nyāyasūtra*-s with the *Vātsyāyana-Bhāṣya*, Poona Oriental Series 58 & 59 (Poona, 1939). - The *Nyāyakośa* (3rd edition), s.v. *pratitantrasiddhānta*, quotes the *Nyāyabhāṣya* passage substituting *Naiyāyikānām* for *Yogānām*.

10. Cf. also H.N. Randle, *Indian Logic in the Early Schools: A Study of the Nyāyadarśana in its Relation to the Early Logic of other Schools* (Oxford University Press, 1930), p. 3 & n. 1; Ruben, *op. cit.*, Anm. 216 (p. 206).

11. Cf. *Sāṃkhya-kārikā* 25. This is also the Yoga view as set forth in the *Vyāsabhāṣya*. See *Vyāsabhāṣya* III, 47 with Vācaspatimiśra's *Tattvavaiśārādī* (*Ānandāśrama Sanskrit Series* 47, Poona, 1904).

originating from the 'elements' <sup>12</sup>. Chaṭṭopādhyāya thus came to the conclusion: 'The meaning of the term *yoga* in Vātsyāyana and Uddyotakara is certainly « Naiyāyika »'. This conclusion was contested, directly by H. Jacobi <sup>13</sup> and indirectly by E. H. Johnston <sup>14</sup>, but was reaffirmed, about thirty years later, with new evidence by E. Frauwallner: 'Der Name *Yauga* oder *Yoga* wird nicht nur in späten Jaina-Werken für die Anhänger des Nyāya- und Vaiśeṣika verwendet. Er findet sich schon in älterer Zeit und lässt sich gelegentlich auch in nichtjainistischen Werken nachweisen' (z. B. Śālikanātha, *Rjuvimalā* S. 209, 25)' <sup>15</sup>.

Whatever the explanation of the fact that the followers of Nyāya and Vaiśeṣika are called *Yoga-s* or *Yauga-s* <sup>16</sup>, I should like to draw attention here to the unanimity among Naiyāyika-s on the point that by the term *yoga* in the *Nyāyabhāṣya* and in the *Nyāyavārttika* the followers of these two systems are meant. The passage from the *Nyāyasiddhāntamālā* of Jayarāma, to which K. Chaṭṭopādhyāya drew attention, has already been quoted above. But, long before, Vācaspatimiśra implicitly identified the *Yoga-s* with the Naiyāyika-s, when he wrote in the *Nyāyavārttikatātparyāṭīkā*: *Naiyāyikānāṃ hi samānaṃ tantraṃ Nyāyaśāstram, paratantraṃ ca Sāṃkhyāśāstram* <sup>17</sup>. Although K. Chaṭṭopādhyāya writes, 'This point (i.e. the identification of the *Yoga-s* with the Naiyāyika-s) seems to have been missed by Vācaspati Miśra' <sup>18</sup>, it seems to me clear that Vācaspati understands the opposition between the Sāṃkhya-s and the *Yoga-s*, referred to by Vātsyāyana and Uddyotakara, as an opposition between the Sāṃkhya-s and the Naiyāyika-s. More explicitly Raghūttama, in his commentary on the *Nyāyabhāṣya*, called *Bhāṣyacandra*, understands by Sāṃkhya both the Sāṃkhya and the Pātañjala-*Yoga* systems, and by *Yoga* the Nyāya and the Vaiśeṣika systems: *Sāṃkhyāṃ Pātañjalaṃ ca parasparaṃ samānatāntraṃ, te ca Nyāya-Vaiśeṣike ca parasparaṃ paratan-*

12. Cf. *Nyāyasūtra* I, 1, 12; Jayantabhaṭṭa, *Nyāyamañjarī* II, pp. 48ff. - Sadananda Bhaduri, *Studies in Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika Metaphysics* (Poona, Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, 1947), p. 154.

13. Article quoted p. 40, n. 3 above, pp. 609-10.

14. E.H. Johnston, 'Some Sāṃkhya and Yoga Conceptions of the Śvetāśvatara Upaniṣad', *JRAS.* 1930, p. 870.

15. E. Frauwallner, *op. cit.*, n. 138 (p. 324). - In the fifth volume of his *History of Indian Philosophy* (Cambridge, 1955), Dasgupta discusses passages from Jaina writers who use the term *yauga* for designating the Naiyāyika-s (pp. 9, 15, 144); but, to my knowledge, he never corrected the misinterpretation contained in the first volume (see p. 40 above). [The text of the *Rjuvimalā*, referred to by Frauwallner, is not available to me at present].

16. See Chaṭṭopādhyāya, *loc. cit.*, p. 857; Jacobi, *loc. cit.*, p. 609; Ruben, *op. cit.*, Ann. 216 (p. 206) ['*Yoga* = Nyāya (= yukti)': cf. below].

17. *Nyāyavārttikatātparyāṭīkā*, *loc. cit.* - Vācaspati, it has been stated above (p. 39, n. 1), interprets the word *samāna* in the sense of 'one': *samānaśabda ekaparyāyaḥ*.

18. *Loc. cit.*, p. 855.

*tram*<sup>19</sup>. It is also interesting to note that Raghūttama explains the word *yoga* in this context as derived from *yoga*, synonym of *yukti* = *tarka* 'reasoning': *yogo yuktiḥ tarkaḥ pradhānatayā vidyate yeṣāṃ te Yogāḥ, arśaādītvāt ac*<sup>20</sup>.

---

19. Gaṅgānātha Jhā's edition (cited above, p. 40, n. 3), p. 132. - This point also is missed by Chaṭṭopādhyāya, when he writes (*loc. cit.*, p. 855) that Raghūttama interprets *Yoga* in the sense of *Vaiśeṣika* as do the Pandits.

20. *Ibid.*, p. 133. - Cf. Pāṇini V, 2, 127 (*arśaādibhyo 'c*), with *Kāśikāvṛtti*, and *Gaṇaratnamahodadhi* VII, 432 (ed. by J. Eggeling, reprinted Delhi, Motilal Banarsidass, 1963). - On *yoga* = *yukti* see also *Nyāyakośa* (3rd edition), s.v. *yoga*, p. 671. This is also one of the meanings of *yoga* given in the *Amarakośa* (quoted by Mallinātha on *Kumārasaṃbhava* III, 58).